

Planning Report



Thursday, November 5, 2015

NE Quad, Subarea 3 – Hawthorne Commons

Case Summary

Agenda Item	2
Case Number	15-024INF
Proposal	An 86-unit multiple-family development within 22, one-story buildings.
Request	Informal review and feedback for this proposal prior to the final development plan application.
Site Location	West of Wyandotte Woods Boulevard, 1,000 feet north of the intersection with Emerald Parkway within Subarea 3 of the Northeast Quadrant Planned Unit Development District.
Owner	Homewood Corporation
Applicant	Treplus Communities; Glen Dugger, Smith and Hale
Case Manager	Jennifer Rauch, AICP, Senior Planner (614) 410-4690 jrauch@dublin.oh.us
Planning Recommendation	Discussion and Feedback <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Is the proposed site layout appropriate given the existing site conditions?2) Is the Commission supportive of the encroachment into the east, south and west setbacks?3) Other considerations by the Commission.



 City of Dublin	15-024INF Informal Review NE Quad, Subarea 3, Treplus Communities Emerald Parkway & Wyandotte Woods Boulevard	<div data-bbox="1096 1701 1291 1785">0 250 500 Feet</div> <div data-bbox="1307 1680 1380 1785"></div>
---	--	--

Facts

Site Area	13.3-acre site
Zoning	PUD, Planned Unit Development (NE Quad plan)
Surrounding Zoning and Uses	<p>North: PUD; Single Family homes in the Wyandotte Woods Subdivision, NE Quad PUD</p> <p>South: PUD; Dublin Scioto High School, NE Quad PUD</p> <p>East: PUD; Multiple Family in the Residences at Scioto Crossings, NE Quad PUD</p> <p>West: PUD; Dublin Scioto High School sport fields, NE Quad PUD</p>
Site Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topography slopes 12 feet from north to south • Heavily wooded with mature trees, especially to the south and east • Retention pond in the northeast portion of the site constructed as part of the infrastructure for Wyandotte Woods, Section 8
Site History	Site history provided at the end of this report.
Neighborhood Contact	The developer met with representatives of adjacent neighborhoods and the East Dublin Civic Association with the revised proposal to gain feedback regarding the project.
Update	The applicant has met with staff several times since the original proposal review in April by the Commission. The proposed layout maintains the one-story, empty nester product supported by the neighbors and the Commission. The proposed revisions to the plans provide an opportunity for some nesting of units on the site, to preserve the landmark trees, and to accommodate stormwater management on site.

Details

Informal

Proposal	The proposal includes 22, one-story buildings, which contain 86 units of one, two, and two-plus bedrooms. A community center is on the north side of the main entrance into the development. Parking is provided within the unit or driveway and a small public parking area is adjacent to the community center.
Density	The development text permits multi-family dwellings at a density of 8.6 units per acre, not to exceed 120 units. At 86 units, the proposal has a density of 6.4 units per acre.
Setbacks and Buffering	The required building and pavement setbacks are 35 feet for the front yard and 25 feet for the side and rear. The development text requires perimeter buffering along the north, west, and south sides when adjacent to single-family or school property, and must contain a mixture of evergreen and deciduous plant material. The current proposal maintains the 25-foot setback along all the northern property line, adjacent to the existing single-family lots. The east, south and west areas indicate encroachments into the setbacks to accommodate the

Details	Informal
	<p>revised site layout, which would require a text modification should the Commission be supportive of the request.</p>
Access and Parking	<p>There is one main vehicular entrance from Wyandotte Woods Boulevard at the northeast corner of the site. A private internal street network connects the buildings throughout the site with a two-way loop road and one-way service drives providing access to the rear-loaded units.</p> <p>Code requires 2.5 parking spaces per dwelling, or 215 spaces. A total of 326 spaces are provided in the proposed garages or driveways and the small public parking area located adjacent to the proposed community center. Visitor parking is limited.</p>
Connectivity	<p>Sidewalks are on one side of the private drive and throughout the central portion of the site. Individual sidewalks lead to each building from the main drive. Additional connections are shown connecting the site externally, including the school site to the east and the existing multi-use path to the west.</p>
Architecture	<p>The proposed site plan concept shows 22, one-story buildings located throughout the site. The units are a combination of front-loaded and rear-loaded garages. The building design is more contemporary, using flat roofs and angular elements to break up the longer facades of the buildings. The materials are stone, siding and metal and are mixed throughout each building.</p>
Tree Preservation	<p>The majority of the Code protected trees are located in the east and southeast portion of the site. The proposal indicates the preservation of trees in certain portions of the eastern property line, as well as seven of the existing landmark trees. The applicant and planning staff conducted a site visit to identify the trees and areas of trees that provide the most benefit to the site and proposed site design. The applicant has made great efforts to redesign the site layout to ensure more landmark trees are preserved. An updated tree preservation and replacement plan were provided for review with the proposal.</p>
Stormwater Management	<p>The proposed development will be required to meet stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53. The previous stormwater management plan showed an expansion of the existing pond located on the north side of the entrance drive from Wyandotte Woods Boulevard and a new retention basin in the southern portion of the site. Concerns were raised by staff during the initial review that the proposed ponds were undersized to accommodate the proposal. Additionally, the Commission requested the applicant incorporate alternative stormwater methods.</p>

Details

Informal

Following the Commission review, the applicant has met with engineering and planning staff regarding the options for stormwater management. The applicant has also met with Dublin City School officials to discuss the proposed development and stormwater management because the site will discharge directly onto the Dublin Scioto High School property. Dublin school officials indicated they do not want any improvements that would result in additional maintenance to their property. The applicant has investigated a series of options to accommodate stormwater on their site in addition to minimizing impacts to the school property. The applicant has identified the requirements to meet stormwater management are greater than anticipated with the original preliminary development plan in 1990. It has also been identified that the existing school drainage system is undersized and did not account for the undeveloped site.

The applicant has proposed a retention basin centrally located on their site in addition to permeable pavers and underground storage. Proposed storm sewer will connect to an existing catch basin at the north end of the school property as a means to discharge the site runoff. A drainage easement will be needed to install and maintain the proposed connection to the school's catch basin.

It will need to be demonstrated that the proposed improvements will meet stormwater requirements as defined in Chapter 53 in addition to not adversely impacting the school property. The applicant has agreed to analyze the school's existing drainage system with the proposed development in order to demonstrate and communicate to both City staff and school officials that the proposed development will not adversely impact the school property. This analysis will also include preparing an exhibit to show the limits of ponding on school property in both the pre developed and post developed condition.

Analysis Informal

General

Planning recommends the Commission consider this proposal with respect to the site layout, setback, tree preservation and compatibility with surrounding development. The following provides additional details and discussion questions to consider.

1. Is the revised site layout appropriate given the existing site conditions?

The site contains a significant number of site constraints due to changes in topography, existing trees, and stormwater management requirements. The proposal covers a significant portion of the existing site. The site plan was revised to retain 7 of the 9 landmark trees and the significant existing trees along the eastern property line.

2. Is the Commission supportive of the encroachment into the east, south and west setbacks?

Previous proposals met the required setback and buffer along the property lines, The current proposal indicates encroachments into the 25-foot setback along the east, south and west property lines to accommodate the revised site layout.

Recommendation Informal

Summary

The Informal Review provides the opportunity for feedback for an applicant in the first stage of contemplating development to allow staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission to provide non-binding feedback to an applicant. Planning recommends the Commission consider this proposal with respect to the site layout, tree preservation and compatibility with surrounding development. Summarized below are suggested questions to guide the Commission discussion.

Discussion Questions

- 1) Is the proposed site layout appropriate given the existing site conditions?
- 2) Is the Commission supportive of the encroachment into the east, south and west setbacks?
- 3) Other considerations by the Commission.

SITE HISTORY

1990

PUD zoning approved for NE Quad Planned Development

1995, 2003 and 2005

Amendments to approved preliminary development plan (not involving this Subarea)

November 2007

Informal review for a 135-unit apartment development on this site (Case 07-103INF)

July 2008

Second informal review prior to the submission of a formal final development plan (Case 08-058INF)

June 18, 2009

Denial of final development plan for 110-unit multiple family development (Case 09-018FDP)

September 16, 2010

The Commission informally reviewed and discussed a proposal for a 110-unit multiple-family development. Three residents from the neighborhood also provided comments. While acknowledging some improvements from what was submitted to the Commission in 2009, the Commissioners did not believe that the modifications adequately addressed previous comments and concerns. The Commission stated that the proposal continues to create a separated environment with unusable open space and an uninviting streetscape lacking any pedestrian realm. A record of the meeting was forwarded to City Council. (Case 10-032INF)

May 15, 2014

The Commission informally reviewed and discussed a proposal for a 120-unit multiple-family development in three, four-story buildings. The Commissioners discussed the improvements from the previous proposals for development. Some Commissioners favored the benefits of having taller buildings and the benefits of preserving trees and providing more open space, particularly given the topography of the site. Some Commissioners were concerned about the proposed height of the buildings and how they would fit within the existing neighborhood. They discussed the single entrance for this development and the potential for it diverting traffic through the Wyandotte Woods neighborhood. The Commission was also concerned about the proposal for covered parking and the proposed architecture. Some Commission members suggested that four-story buildings could be accepted but would require high-quality architecture and materials. Commissioners advised the applicant to investigate parking below the building to decrease the surface parking. The Commission encouraged the applicant to make the clubhouse and pool a visually amenity for the residents. (Case 14-032INF)

July 17, 2014

The Commission informally reviewed and discussed the revised proposal for a 120-unit multiple-family development. Adjacent residents commented on the importance of using high quality materials, tree preservation and creating a community with enduring value. The Commission complimented the applicant on the improved architecture and preferred the eliminated of the previously proposed covered parking. Commissioners suggested increasing the open space to the north by moving buildings farther south. The

SITE HISTORY

Commission agreed with staff for the need to downplay the emergency access drive and encouraged the applicant to make sure that all details for the buildings are well thought out and materials are selected carefully. Commissioners emphasized the importance of tree preservation and creating quality stormwater management facilities. (Case 14-032INF)

October 2, 2014

The Commission disapproved a proposal to modify the development text to allow the building height to be increased to 47 feet, 6 inches tall with stipulations that the building and site layout utilize the site topography, ensure increased setbacks from the existing neighborhood and aim to preserve the existing natural features. The proposed text modification was reviewed separately of the overall final development plan. (Case 14-098FDP)

April 2, 2015

The Commission informally reviewed and discussed a proposal for an 86-unit multiple-family development in 17, one-story buildings. The Commission was supportive of the single-story concept geared toward empty nesters and appreciated the incorporation of many units with rear-loaded garages, as it removed the garages from the main drives. The Commission raised concerns regarding how much of the site was covered with the proposed development. They encouraged the applicant to incorporate an increased buffer/setback from the single-family homes to the north and preserve additional trees throughout the site. The Commission asked the applicant to address stormwater needs for the site and to look at the existing and proposed ponds as amenities. They encouraged the applicant to consider alternative stormwater solutions in the design. The Commission directed the applicant to relocate the proposed dumpster and to ensure connectivity is provided throughout the development and external to the site. The Commission raised concerns about the location of the open space and the sense of the area as a private open space and appearing as inaccessible to all residents. They also asked for additional details regarding the proposed materials, architecture design and garage doors as the project moves forward. Some Commissioners also requested the applicant consider relocating the community center.